REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-23 and 37-54 are pending in the present application. Several claims have been amended where appropriate to better define the claimed invention. The amended/new claims find support in the original specification and drawings. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The new *35 U.S.C. 103(a)* rejections of all claims as being obvious over *Washington* in view of *Gourdol*, *Kovarik* and further in view of *Pham* are noted. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references singly or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the claimed invention.

As to **independent claim 1**, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently applied prior art references fail to teach or suggest the claim feature(s) of

> **changing the icon appearance of the plurality of icons currently displayed on the display system to the new icon appearance in accordance to the changed sample icon when display property parameter values corresponding to the new icon appearance are within a predetermined range of values supported by the display system**

None of the prior art references, either alone or in any combination, teach or suggest making the change in the appearance of icons of a display system conditioned on whether the new icon appearance is determined to be within a **predetermined range of values** that are supported by the display system.

This claim amendment is supported by at least paragraph [0039] of the application publication No. US2004/0090470. According to several embodiments disclosed in the instant application, a sample icon is first displayed in the icon control window as illustrated in any one of Figs. 5-8 of the current application. The sample icon is in some embodiments a representation of a plurality of icons that are currently being displayed in the display system. This **plurality of icons currently displayed on the display system** may comprise all (or less than all) of the icons in the display system. Then, inputs are made to change the appearance of the sample icon in the

icon control window, with the intention of setting a new appearance for the **plurality of icons currently displayed on the display system** based on the appearance of the sample icon. However before changing the appearance of the **plurality of icons currently displayed on the display system** to mimic the sample icon, it is first determined whether the new icon appearance is supported by the display system. For example, the sample icon size might be so large that changing the appearance of the **plurality of icons currently displayed on the display system** to mimic the sample icon will result in such a large new icon size that some icons (that are currently displayed by the display system) may no longer be displayable on the same display system. This would be a situation where the **new icon appearance** is *not* within the **predetermined range of values supported by the display system**. By making the change in the appearance of icons of a display system *conditioned* on whether the new icon appearance is determined to be within a predetermined range of values that are supported by the display system, such an issue can be prevented from occurring within a display system.

The Office's reliance on *Kovarik* for the claim feature is noted. While *Kovarik* appears to teach first checking the size of a newly set ***window*** size against the actual display terminal's physical display screen size (col. 8, lines 25-53), this teaching does not specifically teach or suggest determining whether the **values corresponding to the *new icon appearance* are within a predetermined range of values supported by the display system** as claimed. In other words, none of the prior art references teach or suggest checking the appearance values of ***icons*** against a **predetermined range of values supported by the display system**. A ***window*** size cannot be readable on the claimed ***icon*** **appearance** as recited in the claim.

Independent claim 1 is therefore patentable over the applied art of record.

Independent claims 14, 23 and 43 include features similar to those of claim 1, and should be considered patentable for at least the reasons detailed with respect to claim 1.

The **dependent claims** are considered patentable at least for the reason(s) advanced with respect to the respective independent claim(s).

As to **claim 11**, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's position that the applied references teach or suggest the claim feature "displaying the icon control window on the display screen if the current display property parameter values are determined to be valid."

The Office's reliance on the same teaching of *Kovarik* for this claim feature is noted. Applicants respectfully submit that *Kovarik* as applied in the Office Action discloses, at best and if at all, checking only new parameter values. The claimed subject matter to the contrary requires determining the validity of the current parameter values.

In addition, *Kovarik*'s checking, in the context of the Office's proposed combination with *Washington* and *Gourdol*, would occur after any icon control window (*Washington* at 8:9-25, 40-63 as applied in the Office Action) has been displayed. In contrast, the claimed subject matter requires determining the validity of the current parameter values as a condition for displaying a icon control window, i.e., before displaying the icon control window.

Claim 11 is therefore separately patentable.

As to **claim 42**, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references, especially *Kovarik*, fail to teach or suggest "if the current display property parameter values are determined to be invalid, changing the invalid display property parameter values to valid display property parameter values before said generating the first registry subkey."

The Office's obviousness rationale found on page 8 of the Office Action is conclusory and is not a clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.[1]

Further, *Kovarik*, as noted above with respect to claim 11, does not at all consider current parameter values.

Finally, if *Kovarik* determines that the parameter values are invalid, no changes would be made contrary to the claim requirement. *See Kovarik* at column 8 lines 51-53.

[1] Rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. at 417, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Claim 42 is therefore separately patentable.

Each of the rejections has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 29, 2011
YSH/KL/jr